

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 5, 8, and 9 has been amended. Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 20, 21 and 23 remain in the application. Claim 23 has been added. Re-examination and reconsideration of the application as amended is requested.

The examiner states that claim 5, 7 through 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Kohn in view of Siegel and Bird. The examiner states that Kohn shows a removable liner the four sides on the bottom. Siegel and Bird show removable pouches that can be placed on the sides of the liner. The examiner said it would be obvious for a person skilled in the art to combine these three patents to better organize the contents of the purse.

Claim 5 has been amended. The preamble has been amended. After the word purse the words "system which allows individuals to chose the accessory organizers and design there own purse and still allow for the purse to be economically mass produced" have been added. Basis for this is found in the specification on page 3 lines 14 through page 4 line 18. In element a the words "a housing" have been deleted and replaced with the words "two or more purses each with a different style or color." Basis for this is found

in the specifications on page 13 lines 16 through 19. Element b has been deleted and replaced with previous element c. This element has been amended. The word "removable" has been placed before the word "container." The word "different" has been placed before the word "purse." The words "form the different purses" have been placed after the word "removed." Basis for this is found in the specification on page 13 lines 16 through page 14 line 19. Element d of the claim is now element c. This element has been amended. The words "a plurality of" has been added to the beginning of the element and the word "items" has been replaced with the words "specific accessories."

Element e of the original claim is now element d. It has been substantially amended. The words "first attachment" has been placed before the word "means" and the word "removable" has been placed before the word "container. After the word container the words "allowing for the inner pouches to be releasably attached to the inner sides to the removable container and each inner pouches can be attach at many different position along the inner sides of the removable container and allows an individual to design and organize the placement of each pouch and said inner pouches can be selectively interchanged, thus allowing an individual to select the type and placement of each pouch within the removable container and to be

able to change the placement and type of pouches used at any time." Basis for this is found in the specification on page 13 lines 5 through 11.

A new element e has been added. It states " e. inner pouches chosen from a group c brush, comb, address book holder, calendar holder, jewelry, a water bottle, personal hygiene carrier, tissues, airline ticket pouch, receipt holder, pick holder, propane curling iron holder, tissue holder, or passport." Basis for these two additions can be found in the specification on page 11 line 5 through page 12 line 18.

As point out above Claim 5 now call for a purse system and in element e it calls for the pouches taken from a group that includes pouches for a water bottle, personal hygiene carrier, tissues, airline ticket, receipt holder, pick holder, propane curling iron holder, tissue holder, or passport. Only Bird and Siegel show pouches and Bird only shows pouches for medical supplies. Siegel does not show any pouches for the above group. Thus Claim 5 is clearly patentable over Kohn in view of Siegel and Bird.

Claims 7 and 10 through 13 and 16 have been canceled. Claims 8 and 9 have been amended. In both claim 8 and 9 the words "first attachment" has been placed before the word "means" and the words "for attaching the inner pouches to the inner sides of the container" have been replaced with "cooperating attachment means." Basis for this is found in the specifications

on page 10 lines 11 and 12. Claims 8 and 9 are dependant on claim 5. Thus the same argument that applies to claim 5 applies to claim 8 and 9. Thus Claim 8 and 9 are clearly patentable over Kohn in view of Siegel and Bird.

The examiner has rejected claims 6 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the reference as applied to claim 5 and further in view of Cantor. The same argument that applies above to claims 5 would also apply to claims 6 and 20. Cantor does not show any pouches for a water bottle, personal hygiene carrier, tissues, airline ticket, receipt holder, pick holder, propane curling iron holder, tissue holder, or passport. Thus, applicant believes that claims 6 and 20 are patentable over Kohn in view of Siegel, Bird, and Cantor.

The examiner has rejected claims 21 and 22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the reference as applied to claim 5 and further in view of Murphy. Claim 22 has been canceled. The same argument that applies above to claims 5 would also apply to claim 21. Here again, Murphy does not show any pouches for a water bottle, personal hygiene carrier, tissues, airline ticket, receipt holder, pick holder, propane curling iron holder, tissue holder, or passport. Thus, applicant believes that claim 21 is patentable over Kohn in view of Siegel, Bird, Murphy and Cantor.

The Examiner has rejected claims 11-13 and 16 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Marshall. Applicant has canceled claims 11-13 and 16.

The Examiner has rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) claims 5-10 as being anticipated by Marshall. Marshall shows a crate with a liner. Applicant has amended claim 5 as put forth above. Claim 5 is now a purse system.

Element a calls for two or more purses each with a different style. This is not shown in Marshall. Also claim 5 calls for inner pouches from a group which includes pouches designed for business cards, driver's license, coins, make-up, wallet, or credit card, key holder, pen/pencil holder, glass case, checkbook, medicine brush, comb, address book holder, calendar holder, jewelry a water bottle, personal hygiene carrier, tissues, airline ticket pouch, receipt holder, pick holder, propane curling iron holder, tissue holder, or passport. These are clearly not shown in Marshall.

The examiner has added Hatcher to Marshall and made this rejection a 103 obvious rejection. Applicant transverse this rejection on the grounds that Marshall lies outside the art of purse making. The mere fact that Hatchers purse may look like a crate does not mean that an individual skilled in the art of purse making would know about crates. Further Hatcher is a design patent that does not tell one how to make the purse.

As pointed out above claim 5 calls for inner pouches from a group which includes pouches designed for business cards, driver's license, coins, make-up, wallet, or credit card, key holder, pen/pencil holder, glass case, checkbook, medicine brush, comb, address book holder, calendar holder, jewelry a water bottle, personal hygiene carrier, tissues, airline ticket pouch, receipt holder, pick holder, propane curling iron holder, tissue holder, or passport. These are clearly not shown by either Marshal or Hatcher. Thus Claim 5 is clearly patentable over Marshal in view of Hatcher.

Claims 7 and 10 have been canceled. Claims 6, 8 through 10 and 20 are dependant on claim 5. Thus the same argument that applies to claim 5 applies to claims 6, 8 through 10 and 20. Thus Claim 6, 8 through 10 and 20 are clearly patentable over Marshal in view of Hatcher.

Claim 23 has been added. Claim 23 is as follows:

23. (new) A purse as in claim 5 further comprising:
- a. a handle chosen from a set of handles and shoulder straps.

Basis for this claim is found in the specification on page 8 lines 4 through 10.

Neither Kohn, Siegel, Bird, Murphy, Cantor, Marshal or Hatcher show a purse system where an individual can choose a handle from a set of handles and shoulder straps. Thus Claim 23 is clearly patentable over Kohn, Siegel, Bird, Murphy, Cantor, Marshal and Hatcher taken individually or in combination.


Applicant, being a working woman, has found that purses are willfully inadequate in carrying the items that she wishes to carry and have organized within here purse. She further looked at other working individuals and found that they too, although wanting different items from her, found their purses woefully inadequate. Also, after talking with many other women who were not in the workforce, she found that purses on the whole, each individual had a different view at what should be in it and what should not. These wishes were woefully inaccurately taken care of in the market place. The applicant realized that the reason for this was that it was virtually impossible to produce a customized purse for each individual due to the manufacturing cost. Applicant has found a way to do this by creating different pouches for different uses and designing a liner for the purse that allows these pouches to be attached at the point where an individual wishes them to be. Thus, every woman should customize her own purse by placing the pouches in at the point she wished.

Further, applicant has found a way to do this in the market place electronically cutting down even further on the manufacturing expense. Thus, applicant believes that she has found a major problem with purses and has solved that problem.

Furthermore, it is believed that the claims, as now amended, define an invention which is unobvious over US Patents to Kohn, Siegel, Murphy, Cantor, Marshal, Hatcher and PCT patent to Bird taken singularly or in combination. None of these patents call for the pouches taken from a group that includes pouches for a water bottle, personal hygiene carrier, tissues, airline ticket, receipt holder, pick holder, propane curling iron holder, tissue holder, or passport. Further, none of these patents point out the problem that applicant has found and spelled out in her specifications that individual women have individual needs that needs to be addressed in a purse. None of the purses on the market meet those specific needs. Thus, applicant has designed a purse that can be customized and yet still mass produced to meet the woman's needs.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested.

Allowance of claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 20, 21 and 23 at an early date is solicited.



Jerry Semer
617 Croghan Street
Fremont, Ohio 43420
(419) 332-2221
Registration No. 33,087